

THE THRESHOLD FOR ACKERMANNIAN RAMSEY NUMBERS

MENACHEM KOJMAN AND ERAN OMRI

ABSTRACT. For a function $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, the g -regressive Ramsey number of k is the least N so that

$$N \xrightarrow{\min} (k)_g.$$

This symbol means: for every $c : [N]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that satisfies $c(m, n) \leq g(\min\{m, n\})$ there is a *min-homogeneous* $H \subseteq N$ of size k , that is, the color $c(m, n)$ of a pair $\{m, n\} \subseteq H$ depends only on $\min\{m, n\}$.

It is known ([4, 5]) that Id-regressive Ramsey numbers grow in k as fast as $\text{Ack}(k)$, Ackermann's function in k . On the other hand, for constant g , the g -regressive Ramsey numbers grow exponentially in k , and are therefore primitive recursive in k .

We compute below the threshold in which g -regressive Ramsey numbers cease to be primitive recursive and become Ackermannian, by proving:

Theorem. *Suppose $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is weakly increasing. Then the g -regressive Ramsey numbers are primitive recursive if and only if for every $t > 0$ there is some M_t so that for all $n \geq M_t$ it holds that $g(m) < n^{1/t}$ and M_t is bounded by a primitive recursive function in t .*

1. INTRODUCTION

We investigate Ramsey properties of pair-colorings of natural numbers in which the set of possible colors of a pair depends on the pair. A number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is identified with the set $\{m \in \mathbb{N} : m < n\}$. The set of all two-element subsets of a set X is denoted by $[X]^2$.

Definition 1.1. *For a function $f : [\mathbb{N}]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, an f -coloring of pairs is a function $c : [\mathbb{N}]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ so that $c(m, n) \leq f(m, n)$ for all $\{m, n\} \in [\mathbb{N}]^2$.*

The standard Ramsey theorems for pairs can be thought of as dealing with f -colorings for constant f . When coloring all pairs from N by C colors, there will be a monochromatic subset $B \subseteq N$ of size k if $C^{k \cdot C} \leq N$, by the standard proof of Ramsey's theorem.

On the other hand, if f is sufficiently large, that is, if $f(m, n) \geq \binom{\max\{m, n\}+1}{2}$, then any coloring is equivalent to an f coloring. Two colorings c_1, c_2 are equivalent if for all $(m, n), (m', n')$ it holds that $c_1(m, n) = c_1(m', n')$ iff $c_2(m, n) = c_2(m', n')$, that is, they induce the same partition of unordered pairs.

The Ramsey behaviour of colorings of $[\mathbb{N}]^2$ with no limitations at all on the set of colors is governed by the *Canonical Ramsey Theorem* by Erdős and Rado, which asserts that for any pair coloring $c : [\mathbb{N}]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ there is an infinite $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ so that $c \upharpoonright [B]^2$ is *canonical*, that is, is equivalent to one of the following four colorings: $c_1(m, n) = \min(m, n)$, $c_2(m, n) = \max(m, n)$, $c_3(m, n) = 0$, a constant coloring or $c_4(m, n) = (m, n)$, a 1-1 coloring.

The finite version of the canonical Ramsey theorem asserts that for every k there exists N so that for every $c : [N]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ there is $B \in [N]^k$ so that $c \upharpoonright B$ is canonical. Double exponential upper and lower bounds on N in terms of k are known for the finite canonical Ramsey theorem [6].

We are interested here in f -colorings where $f(m, n)$ depends only on $\min\{m, n\}$, that is, when $f(m, n) = g(\min\{m, n\})$ for some function $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. When $g = \text{Id}$, such a coloring is called *regressive*. In other words, c is regressive if $c(m, n) \leq \min\{m, n\}$. More generally, we say that a coloring c is g -regressive if $c(m, n) \leq g(\min\{m, n\})$.

A set $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is *min-homogeneous* for a coloring c if $c(m, n)$ depends only on $\min\{m, n\}$ for all $(m, n) \in [B]^2$. The important feature of min-homogeneity is that no matter how large a function g is, a g -regressive min-homogeneity Ramsey number exists for every k :

Fact 1.2. *Let $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Then*

- (1) *for every g -regressive coloring $c : [\mathbb{N}]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ there is an infinite $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $c \upharpoonright [B]^2$ is min-homogeneous.*
- (2) *for every k there is some N so that for every g -regressive coloring $c : [N]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ there is a min-homogeneous $B \subseteq N$ of size at least k .*

Proof. The first item follows from the infinite canonical Ramsey theorem, since a regressive coloring cannot be equivalent neither to $\max\{m, n\}$ nor to a 1-1 coloring on an infinite set. The second item follows from the first via compactness. $\square$

Let us introduce the suitable symbolic notation for discussing g -Regressive colorings.

Definition 1.3. *Let $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function. Then:*

- (1) *The symbol $N \longrightarrow (k)_g$ means: for every g -regressive colorings $c : [N]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ there is a homogeneous $B \subseteq N$ of size k .*
- (2) *The symbol $N \xrightarrow{\min} (k)_g$ means: for every g -regressive coloring $c : [N] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ there is a min-homogeneous $B \subseteq N$ of size k .*

The g -regressive Ramsey theorem (for pairs) is the statement

$$(\forall k)(\exists N)(N \xrightarrow{\min} (k)_g)$$

Recall that the standard proof of Ramsey's theorem gives, for the constant number of colors C ,

$$C^k \xrightarrow{\min} (k)_C, \quad C^{k \cdot C} \longrightarrow (k)_C$$

For any function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ the function $f^{(n)}$ is defined by $f^{(0)}(x) = x$ and $f^{(n+1)}(x) = f(f^{(n)}(x))$. We recall that Ackermann's function is defined as $Ack(n) = A_n(n)$ where each A_n is the standard n -th approximation of the Ackermann function, defined by:

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} A_1(n) &= n + 1 \\ A_{i+1}(n) &= A_i^{(n)}(n) \end{aligned}$$

It is well known (see e.g. [2]) that each approximation A_n is *primitive recursive* and that every primitive recursive function is eventually dominated by some A_n . Thus Ackermann's function eventually dominates every primitive recursive function and is *truly* rapidly growing¹.

Ackermannian lower and upper bounds on N in terms of k are known for the regressive Ramsey theorem for $g = \text{Id}$. This was first proved using methods from mathematical logic and then elementarily [4, 5].

We are interested here in locating the threshold for the formidable leap from a primitive recursive upper bound to an Ackermannian lower bound in the g -regressive Ramsey theorem. This threshold obviously lies between the constant functions and Id .

We shall see below that if $g(m) \leq m^{\frac{1}{\beta(m)}}$ for some unbounded and increasing function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and β^{-1} is bounded by a primitive recursive function f , then the g -regressive Ramsey numbers are dominated by f ; but if $g(m) = m^{1/\beta(m)}$ where β grows to infinity sufficiently slowly, that is, when β^{-1} is Ackermannian, then the g -regressive Ramsey number are Ackermannian.

¹See [3], p. 60, for an amusing attempt to "grasp the magnitude" of $A_5(5)$.

All functions below are from $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{N}$ and whenever an expression x may not be integer, it is intended to be replaced by $\lfloor x \rfloor$.

2. THE RESULTS

2.1. Min-Homogeneity. For any unbounded function $\beta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ define

$$\beta^{-1}(t) = \min(\{n : \beta(n) \geq t\})$$

(2)

Notation 2.1. For a given $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, let $\nu_g(k)$ denote the least N which satisfies $N \xrightarrow{\min} (k)_g$.

Theorem 2.2. Suppose $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ are nonzero, weakly increasing and $g(n) \leq n^{1/\beta(n)}$ for all n . Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $\nu_g(k) \leq \beta^{-1}(k)$.

Proof. Given $1 < k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $N = \beta^{-1}(k)$ and we will show that $N \xrightarrow{\min} (k)_g$. Let $C = g(N)$. Since g is increasing, $g(m) \leq g(N)$ for all $m < N$. Thus it suffices to show that for every coloring $c : [N] \rightarrow C$ there exists a min-homogeneous $B \subseteq N$ of size k . This holds if $C^k \leq N$. Since $C = g(N) \leq N^{1/\beta(N)}$ it suffices to show that $(N^{1/\beta(N)})^k \leq N$ — which is obvious, since $\beta(N) \geq k$. $\square$

Corollary 2.3. Suppose g and β are weakly increasing, $g(n) \leq n^{1/\beta(n)}$ for all n and β^{-1} is bounded by a primitive recursive function. Then ν_g is bounded by a primitive recursive function. If, furthermore, g is primitive recursive, then ν_g is primitive recursive.

Proof. By the previous theorem ν_g is bounded by β^{-1} and thus is bounded by a primitive recursive function. Since the relation $N \xrightarrow{\min} (k)_g$ is primitive recursive when g is, the computation of ν_g requires a bounded search for a primitive recursive relation and therefore ν_g is primitive recursive. $\square$

We now begin working towards the proof of the converse of Corollary 2.3: to show that if β^{-1} is Ackermann and $g(n) = n^{1/\beta(n)}$ then ν_g is Ackermannian. We begin by proving the special case that $g(n) = n^{1/\beta(n)}$ and $\beta(n)$ is bounded.

Lemma 2.4. For every $t > 0$ let $g_t(n) = n^{1/t}$. Then the function ν_{g_t} eventually dominates every primitive recursive function for all $t > 0$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on $t > 0$.

The proof involves constructing a “bad” f_t -regressive coloring for $t \geq 1$ by a generalization of the method of construction of a bad Id-regressive coloring in [5].

Definition 2.5. For a given $t \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, we define a sequence of functions $(f_t)_i : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows.

$$(3) \quad (f_t)_1(n) = n + 1$$

$$(4) \quad (f_t)_{i+1}(n) = (f_t)_i^{(\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor)}(n)$$

Claim 2.6. For all $0 < t \in \mathbb{N}$ the function $f_t(k) = (f_t)_k(k)$ eventually dominates every primitive recursive function.

Proof. By induction on t .

For $t = 1$ the functions $(f_t)_k = A_k$, the standard k -th approximations of Ackermann’s functions, so every primitive recursive function is eventually dominated by $f_t(k)$ (see e.g. [2]).

Claim 2.7. Let $t > 0$. For all $n > 2^t$, $i > 0$ it holds that $(f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}(n^2) > ((f_t)_i(n))^2$.

We prove claim 2.7 by induction on i . For $i = 1$ we need the following:

Observation 2.8. For every $t, k, n > 0$ it holds that $(f_t)_k(n) \geq n + (\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor)^{k-1}$

Proof. We show observation 2.8 by induction on k . If $k = 1$, it follows by definition that $(f_t)_k(n) = n + 1 = n + (\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor)^{k-1}$. Let $k > 1$. By definition $(f_t)_{k+1}(n) = (f_t)_k^{(\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor)}(n)$ and by applying the induction hypothesis $\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor$ times we get that the right hand side of the equation is larger than $n + ((\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor)(\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor)^{k-1})$ which is $n + (\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor)^k$. $\square$

Observation 2.9. $(f_{t+1})_{2t+3}(n^2) > n^2 + 2n + 1$

Proof. By observation 2.8 we have that $(f_{t+1})_{2t+3}(n^2) \geq n^2 + (\lfloor n^{\frac{2}{t+1}} \rfloor)^{2t+2}$.

Now

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 + (\lfloor n^{\frac{2}{t+1}} \rfloor)^{2t+2} &\geq n^2 + (n^{\frac{2}{t+1}} - 1)^{2(t+1)} \\ &\geq n^2 + (n^{\frac{4}{t+1}} - 2n^{\frac{2}{t+1}} + 1)^{t+1} \\ &> n^2 + (n^{\frac{2}{t+1}}(n^{\frac{2}{t+1}} - 2))^{t+1} > 2n^2 > n^2 + 2n + 1 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

When $i = 1$, by observation 2.9, $(f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}(n^2) = (f_{t+1})_{2t+3}(n^2) > n^2 + 2n + 1 = ((f_t)_1(n))^2 = ((f_t)_i(n))^2$

We now assume that claim 2.7 is true for i and prove it for $i + 1$.

Claim 2.10. $\forall j \in \mathbb{N} \ (f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}^{(j)}(n^2) > ((f_t)_i^{(j)}(n))^2$.

Proof. We show claim 2.10 by induction on j . For $j = 1$ the claim is induced by the induction hypothesis for i . For $j > 1$ we have $(f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}^{(j+1)}(n^2) = (f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}((f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}^{(j)}(n^2))$. The latter term is larger than $(f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}(((f_t)_i^{(j)}(n))^2)$ by monotonicity and the induction hypothesis for j . Now, if we denote $n' = (f_t)_i^{(j)}(n)$, we easily see, by the induction hypothesis for j or for i , that $(f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}(((f_t)_i^{(j)}(n))^2) > ((f_t)_i((f_t)_i^{(j)}(n)))^2$ which is, in fact, $((f_t)_i^{(j+1)}(n))^2$ $\square$

We still need to show the induction step for claim 2.7 $(f_{t+1})_{i+1+2t+2}(n^2) = (f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}^{(\lfloor n^{\frac{2}{t+1}} \rfloor)}(n^2) \geq (f_{t+1})_{i+2t+2}^{(\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor)}(n^2)$ and by claim 2.10, the latter term is larger than $((f_t)_i^{(\lfloor n^{1/t} \rfloor)}(n))^2 = ((f_t)_{i+1}(n))^2$

That concludes the proof of claim 2.7 and therefore also of claim 2.6. $\square$

We turn now to the construction of bad g_t -regressive colorings.

For a given natural number $k > 2$ and a given $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that is monotonically increasing such that for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $k \leq \lfloor \frac{\sqrt{g(t)}}{2} \rfloor$, we define a sequence of functions $(f_g)_i : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows.

Definition 2.11. Let $\mu = \mu_g(k) = \min(\{t \in \mathbb{N} : k \leq \lfloor \frac{\sqrt{g(t)}}{2} \rfloor\})$

and let

$$(5) \quad (f_g)_1(n) = n + 1$$

$$(6) \quad (f_g)_{i+1}(n) = (f_g)_i^{(\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{g(n)}}{2} \rfloor)}(n)$$

Define a sequence of semi-metrics $\langle (d_g)_i : i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ on $\{n : n \geq \mu\}$ by setting, for $m, n \geq \mu$,

$$(7) \quad (d_g)_i(m, n) = |\{l \in \mathbb{N} : m < (f_g)_i^{(l)}(\mu) \leq n\}|$$

For $n > m \geq \mu$ let $I_g(m, n)$ be the greatest i for which $(d_g)_i(m, n)$ is positive, and $D_g(m, n) = (d_g)_{I_g(m, n)}(m, n)$.

Let us fix the following (standard) pairing function Pr on $\mathbb{N}^2$

$$\text{Pr}(m, n) = \binom{m+n+1}{2} + n$$

Pr is a bijection between $[\mathbb{N}]^2$ and $\mathbb{N}$ and is monotone in each variable. Observe that if $m, n \leq l$ then $\text{Pr}(m, n) < 4l^2$ for all $l > 2$.

Define a pair coloring c_g on $\{n : n \geq \mu\}$ as follows:

$$(8) \quad c_g(\{m, n\}) = \text{Pr}(I_g(m, n), D_g(m, n))$$

Claim 2.12. For all $n > m \geq \mu$, $D_g(m, n) \leq \frac{\sqrt{g(m)}}{2}$.

Proof. Let $i = I_g(m, n)$. Since $(d_g)_{i+1}(m, n) = 0$, there exist t and l such that $t = (f_g)_{i+1}^{(l)}(\mu) \leq m < n < (f_g)_{i+1}^{(l+1)}(\mu) = (f_g)_{i+1}(t)$. But $(f_g)_{i+1}(t) = (f_g)_i^{(\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{g(t)}}{2} \rfloor)}(t)$ and therefore $\frac{\sqrt{g(t)}}{2} \geq (d_g)_i(t, (f_g)_{i+1}(t)) \geq D_g(m, n)$. $\square$

Claim 2.13. c_g is g -regressive on the interval $[\mu, (f_g)_k(\mu))$.

Proof. Clearly, $(d_g)_k(m, n) = 0$ for $\mu \leq m < n < (f_g)_k(\mu)$ and therefore $I_g(m, n) < k \leq \frac{\sqrt{g(m)}}{2}$. From claim 2.12 we know that $D_g(m, n) \leq \frac{\sqrt{g(m)}}{2}$. Thus, $c_g(\{m, n\}) \leq \text{Pr}(\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{g(m)}}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{\sqrt{g(m)}}{2} \rfloor)$, which is $< g(m)$, since $\frac{\sqrt{g(m)}}{2} > 2$. $\square$

Claim 2.14. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, every sequence $x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_i$ that satisfies $(d_g)_i(x_0, x_i) = 0$ is not min-homogeneous for c_g .

Proof. The claim is proved by induction on i . If $i = 1$ then there are no $x_0 < x_1$ with $(d_g)_1(x_0, x_1) = 0$ at all. Let $i > 1$ and suppose to the contrary that $x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_i$ form a min-homogeneous sequence with respect to c_g and that $(d_g)_i(x_0, x_i) = 0$. Necessarily, $I_g(x_0, x_i) = j < i$. By min-homogeneity, $I(x_0, x_1) = j$ as well, and $(d_g)_j(x_0, x_i) = (d_g)_j(x_0, x_1)$. Hence, $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i\}$ is min-homogeneous with $(d_g)_j(x_1, x_i) = 0$ — contrary to the induction hypothesis. $\square$

Corollary 2.15. There exists no $H \subseteq [\mu, (f_g)_k(\mu))$ of size $k+1$ that is min-homogeneous for c_g .

Corollary 2.16. If the function $(f_g)_k(k)$ dominates every primitive recursive function (Ackermannian in terms of k) and $\mu_g(k)$ is bound by some primitive recursive function, then the lower bound for min-homogeneity for g -regressive colorings also dominates every primitive recursive function.

Proof. The collection of primitive recursive functions is closed under composition. Thus, the function $(f_g)_k(\mu_g(k)) - \mu_g(k)$ is Ackermannian in terms of k . Moreover, it is Ackermannian in terms of $\mu_g(k) + k + 1$. Therefore, we may allow ourselves to set the color of every pair (m, n) such that $m < \mu_g(k)$ to be 0 and by that present a g -regressive coloring of $[(f_g)_k(\mu_g(k))]^2$ that yields no min-homogeneous $H \subseteq [(f_g)_k(\mu_g(k))]$ of size $\mu_g(k) + k + 1$. $\square$

Now, to conclude the proof of theorem 2.4 we need only observe that for a given $j \in \mathbb{N}$ the function $\frac{k^{\frac{1}{2j}}}{2}$ grows asymptotically faster than $k^{\frac{1}{4j}}$ and therefore, by claim 2.6, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ $(f_g)_k(k)$ for $g(m) = m^j$ dominates every primitive recursive function. On the other hand, for such g , $\mu_g(k) \leq 4^j k^{2j}$. Hence, by corollary 2.16 we establish that the lower bound for min-homogeneity for g -regressive colorings for $g(m) = m^j$ dominates every primitive recursive function. $\square$

Theorem 2.17. Let $\beta^{-1}(n) := \text{Ack}(n+3)$ (so β is basically Ack^{-1}) and let $g(n) = n^{1/\beta(n)}$. There exists a g -regressive coloring $c : [\mathbb{N}]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for every primitive recursive function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ there exists $N_f \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m > N_f$ and $H \subseteq m$ which is min-homogeneous for c it holds that $f(|H|) < m$.

Proof. We define two increasing sequences $\{k_t\}$ and $\{\mu_t\}$ and then let $\beta(n) = t+1$ if $\mu_t \leq n < \mu_{t+1}$. Using the definition of $(f_g)_i$ given in 2.11, we define a g -regressive coloring c , where $g(n) = n^{1/\beta(n)}$, so that in the interval $[\mu_t, \mu_{t+1})$ there is no min-homogeneous set of size k_t .

We denote $g_t(n) := n^{1/t}$. Let:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_0 &= 0 \\ \mu_1 &= 10^4 \\ k_1 &= 18\end{aligned}$$

And for all $t > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}k_t &= \frac{\sqrt{g_{t-1}(\mu_{t-1})}}{2} = \frac{\mu_{t-1}^{1/2(t-1)}}{2} \\ \mu_t &= \text{Ack}(t+3)\end{aligned}$$

On $[0, \mu_1)$ we define $c(m, n)$ as follows: color all $\{m, n\}$ from $[0, 43)$ regressively by the colors $\{0, 1\}$ with no min-homogeneous set of size 12. This is possible, since the (usual) Ramsey number of 5 is ≥ 43 , so there is a 2-coloring of $[1, 43)$ with no homogeneous set of size 5, hence with no min-homogeneous set of size 11. For $m, n \geq 43$ color as follows: write out $|n - m|$ in base 10 and let $c(m, n) = \text{Pr}(d_1, d_2 + 1)$ where $d_1 \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ is the maximal power of 10 smaller than $|n - m|$ and d_2 is the f_1 -th decimal digit. This coloring allows no min-homogeneous sets of size 6 in $[42, 10^4)$. So letting $c(m, n) = 0$ for $m < 42$ and $42 \leq m \leq 10^4$, we get that below μ_1 there are no min-homogeneous sets of size $k_1 = 18$.

Now we need to define c on $[\mu_{t-1}, \mu_t)$ for all $t > 1$. Let $k_t = \frac{\mu_{t-1}^{1/2(t-1)}}{2}$. Observe that we may color pairs over the interval $[\mu_{t-1}, (f_{g_{t-1}})_{k_t}(\mu_{t-1}))$ if $\mu \geq 4(g_t(k))^2$ using c_{g_t} with μ_t instead of $\mu_{g_t}(k)$. This coloring is g_t -regressive with no min-homogeneous $H \subseteq [\mu, ((f_{g_t})_k(\mu))$ of size $k+1$. This is true since the proofs of claims 2.13 and 2.14 made no use of the minimality of $\mu_{g_t}(k)$.

To define c on $[\mu_{t-1}, \mu_t)$ it suffices, then, to prove:

Claim 2.18. $\text{Ack}(t+3) < (f_{g_{t-1}})_{k_t}(\mu_{t-1})$ for all $t > 1$.

Proof. We first prove claim 2.18 for $t = 2$. We have, by claim 2.19, that $(f_{g_1})_{k_2}(\mu_1) > (A_{k_2-18}(\lfloor \mu_1^{\frac{1}{8}} \rfloor))^8$.

Since $k_2 = 50$, the latter term is $(A_{32}(\lfloor 10^4^{\frac{1}{8}} \rfloor))^8$ and thus larger than $A_{32}(3) > A_5(5)$.

Let $t > 2$. We know that $\mu_{t-1} = \text{Ack}(t+2)$ and hence it clearly holds that $k_t - 16t^2 + 28t - 10 = \frac{\mu_{t-1}^{1/2(t-1)}}{2} - 16t^2 + 28t - 10 = \frac{(\text{Ack}(t+2))^{1/2(t-1)}}{2} - 16t^2 + 28t - 10 > t + 3$ and it also clearly holds that $\mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-5}}} > t + 3$. Thus, by claim 2.19, we have that $(f_{g_{t-1}})_{k_t}(\mu_{t-1}) \geq (A_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-5}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-5}} > A_{t+3}(t+3)$. □

Claim 2.19. For all $t > 1$ it holds that $(f_{g_{t-1}})_{k_t}(\mu_{t-1}) > (A_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-5}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-5}}$

Proof. Observe that $(A_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-5}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-5}}$ is actually $((f_1)_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-5}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-5}}$. Now, by applying claim 2.7 to the latter term, we get $((f_1)_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-5}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-5}} <$

$((f_2)_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10+2+2}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-6}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-6}}$, since the parameter t of claim 2.7 is 1 here. If we apply it now to right hand side term, the parameter t of the claim would be 2 and we would find that the latter term is smaller than $((f_3)_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10+2+2+4+2}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-7}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-7}}$. Generally, if we apply the claim j times we get that $((f_1)_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-5}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-5}} < ((f_{j+1})_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10+j^2+3j}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-5-j}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-5-j}}$ since we may replace $\sum_{l=1}^j 2j$ with j^2+j . Now, if we let $j = 4t-5$, we get $((f_1)_{k_t-16t^2+28t-10}(\lfloor \mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-5}}} \rfloor))^{2^{4t-5}} < (f_{4(t-1)})_{k_t}(\mu_{t-1})$. Note that we are allowed to apply claim 2.7 $4t-5$ times, only if, for all $1 \leq j \leq 4t-5$ it holds that $\mu_{t-1}^{\frac{1}{2^{4t-4-j}}} > 2^j$, or that $\mu_{t-1} > 2^{j2^{4t-4-j}}$ and that is true for all $t > 2$ since μ_{t-1} is clearly larger than $2^{(4(t-1))2^{4(t-1)}}$. For $t = 2$ it is also true and may be easily verified by hand.

On the other hand, it holds that $(f_{g_{t-1}})_{k_t}(\mu_{t-1}) > (f_{4(t-1)})_{k_t}(\mu_{t-1})$ since μ_{t-1} is larger than 2^{4t} for all $t > 1$ and therefore $\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2^{2(t-1)}}}}{2} \geq n^{\frac{1}{4(t-1)}}$. □

Observation 2.20. *The coloring c is g -regressive.*

Proof. For any m, n such that $\beta(m) = \beta(n) = t$ we know that $c(m, n) \leq \lfloor m^{1/t} \rfloor$ since $c(m, n) = c_{g_t}(m, n)$ and c_{g_t} is g_t -regressive on the interval. Otherwise, $c(m, n) = 0$ which is always smaller than $m^{1/\beta(m)}$. □

Observation 2.21. *For any given $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\beta(N) = j$, there is no min-homogeneous $H \subseteq [N]$ of size $(k_{j-1} + 1)^2 + 18$.*

Proof. From claim 2.19 it is clear that for all $t > 1$ it holds that $k_t < k_{t+1}$ and that $k_t > t$. Thus, since at each interval $[\mu_t, \mu_{t+1})$ for ant $t < j$ there exist no min-homogeneous subset of size $k_t + 1$ and hence, no min-homogeneous subset of size $k_{j-1} + 1$. Therefore, in the union of all those intervals there is no min-homogeneous subset of size $(k_t + 1)t < (k_{j-1} + 1)^2$. Now, in the first interval there can be no no min-homogeneous of size 18, there is no min-homogeneous $H \subseteq [N]$ of size $(k_{j-1} + 1)^2 + 18$ in the union of the first j intervals of which $[N]$ is a subset. □

To conclude the proof we only need to observe that given a primitive recursive function f , there exists a $k_f \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n > 4$ it holds that $A_{k_f}(\lfloor n^{1/\lg \lg n} \rfloor) > f((n+1)^2 + 18)$. Now, because k_t grows extremely faster than t , we can find a t such that $k_t - 32(t-1)^2 - 4(t-1) + 3 > k_f$ and $\lg \lg \mu_t > t$. Set N_f to be μ_{t+1} . Given $n > N_f$ with $\beta(n) = j$. We have that $j > t+1$. Assume to the contrary that there exists a min-homogeneous $H \subseteq [n]$ of size $f^{-1}(n)$ then $f^{-1}(n) < (k_{j-1} + 1)^2 + 18$. Thus, $n' = \sqrt{f^{-1}(n) - 18} - 1 < k_{j-1} < \mu_{j-2}$. Now, $n = f((n' + 1)^2 + 18) < A_{k_f}(\lfloor n'^{\frac{1}{\lg \lg n'}} \rfloor) < A_{k_{j-1}-32(j-2)^2-4(j-2)+3}(\lfloor \mu_{j-2}^{\frac{1}{\lg \lg \mu_{j-2}}} \rfloor) < \mu_{j-1}$. Contrary to $\beta(n) = j$. □

We can now prove the main theorem of the paper:

Theorem 2.22. *Suppose $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is eventually smaller than $n^{1/t}$ for every constant $t > 1$. Then ν_g is bouded by a primitive recursive function if an only if the least number M_t which satisfies $g(n) < n^{1/t}$ for all $n \geq M_t$ is bounded by a primitive recursive function in t .*

Proof. Suppose first that M_t is bounded by some primitive recursive function in t . Replacing $g(n)$ by $\max\{g(n) : m \leq n\}$ we may assume that g is weakly increasing and M_t would still be bounded by a primitive recursive function. Now apply Corollary 2.3. This takes care of the “if” part.

The “only if” part follows directly from Theorem 2.22 above. □

2.2. Homogeneity. We look now at the threshold g at which one can guarantee the usual Ramsey theorem for g -regressive colorings, that is, have homogeneous rather than just min-homogeneous sets.

Theorem 2.23. *Suppose $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$ satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f(n)) = \infty$ and let $g(x) = \frac{\lg x}{f(x) \lg \lg x}$ for $x \geq 4$ and $g(x) = 0$ for $x < 4$. Then $\forall k \exists N \ N \rightarrow (k)_g^2$.*

Proof. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$ be a function such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f(n)) = \infty$, and $g(x) = \frac{\lg x}{f(x) \lg \lg x}$ for $x \geq 4$ and $g(x) = 0$ for $x < 4$. Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, find $N \geq k$ so that $f(N) > k$ and $f(N) > f(m)$ for all $m < N$. Such N exists, since $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (f(m)) = \infty$. Since $f(N) > f(m)$ for all $m < N$, it follows that $g(m) \leq g(N)$ for all $m < N$ as well. So given a g -regressive coloring $c : [N]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ we have that $c(m, n) \leq g(N)$ for all $(m, n) \in [N]^2$. Put $C = \lfloor g(N) + 1 \rfloor$. If $C = 1$ then N itself is homogeneous of size $\geq k$, so assume that $C \geq 2$. The standard proof of Ramsey's theorem with C colors gives a homogeneous $B \subseteq N$ of size k in case $N > C^{k \cdot C}$, which holds here, since $\lg g(N) < \lg \lg N$ and therefore

$$C^{k \cdot C} = 2^{\lg C \cdot k \cdot C} = 2^{\lg g(N) \cdot k \cdot g(N)} < 2^{\lg \lg N \cdot k \cdot g(N)} \leq 2^{\lg N} = N$$

It should be noted that this is of interest when f grows slowly (e.g. $f(m) = \log^* m$). □

Theorem 2.24. *For every $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and for $g(i) = \frac{\lg i}{s}$ it holds that $\exists k \forall N \ N \rightarrow (k)_g^2$*

Proof. Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g(i) = \frac{\lg(i)}{s}$. We set $k = 2s + 1$ and we show a g -regressive coloring $C : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ where there exists no $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ of size $\geq k$ that is homogeneous for C . For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $r_s(n)$ be the representation of n in s basis. For any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m < n$ and $\lfloor \log_s(m) \rfloor = \lfloor \log_s(n) \rfloor$, let $f(m, n)$ be the smallest index i such that $r_s(m)[i] \neq r_s(n)[i]$. We define c as

$$c(m, n) = \begin{cases} \lfloor \log_s(m) \rfloor & \text{if } \lfloor \log_s(m) \rfloor \neq \lfloor \log_s(n) \rfloor; \\ f(m, n) & \text{if } \lfloor \log_s(m) \rfloor = \lfloor \log_s(n) \rfloor. \end{cases}$$

Observation 2.25. *Let $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{s+1}\}$ where $y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_{s+1}$, be a homogeneous set for C . Then $\lfloor \log_s(y_1) \rfloor < \lfloor \log_s(y_{s+1}) \rfloor$.*

To show Observation 2.25, let Y be a homogeneous set for C and suppose to the contrary that $\lfloor \log_s(y_1) \rfloor = \lfloor \log_s(y_{s+1}) \rfloor$, from the definition of c we get that f is constant on Y . Thus elements of Y , pairwise differ in the i 'th value in their s basis representation for some index i , which is impossible since there are only s possible values for any index. Contradiction.

Now, Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2s+1}\}$ $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{2s+1}$ and suppose to the contrary that X is homogeneous for C . By observation 2.25 we get that $\lfloor \log_s(x_1) \rfloor < \lfloor \log_s(x_{s+1}) \rfloor < \lfloor \log_s(x_{2s+1}) \rfloor$ and therefore $C(x_1, x_{s+1}) < C(x_{s+1}, x_{2s+1})$ contrary to homogeneity. □

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Blanchard. On Regressive Ramsey Numbers. *J. Comb. Th. A* 100, 189-195.
- [2] C. Calude. Theories of computational complexity. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 35. Amsterdam etc.: North-Holland. XII, 487 p., 1988.
- [3] R. Graham, B. Rothschild and J. Spencer. Ramsey Theory. 2nd edition, *Wiley Interscience series*, 1990.
- [4] A. Kanamori and K. McAloon. On Gödel incompleteness and finite combinatorics. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 33(1), 23-41, 1987.
- [5] M. Kojman and S. Shelah. Regressive Ramsey Numbers are Ackermannian. *J. Comb. Th. A* 86, 177-181 (1999)
- [6] H. Leffman and V. Rödl. On canonical Ramsey numbers for complete graphs versus paths. *Journal of Combinatorial theory, Series B*, 58, 1-13, 1993.
- [7] P. Erdős and G. Mills. Some bounds for the Ramsey-Paris-Harrington numbers. *Journal of Combinatorial theory, Series A*, 30, 53-70, 1981.

- [8] P. Erdős and R. Rado. A combinatorial theorem. *J. London Math. Soc.* 25, 249-255, 1950.
- [9] J. Paris. Independence results for Peano arithmetic. In *J. Symbolic Logic*, 43, 725-731, 1978.
- [10] J. Paris and L. Harrington. A mathematical incompleteness in Peano arithmetic. In J. Barwise, editor, *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*. North-Holland, 1977.
- [11] F. Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. *Proc. London. Math. Soc.* 30, 264-286, 1930.
- [12] K. Gödel. Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme. I, *Monatsh. Math. Phys.* 38 (1931) 173-198.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BEN GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV
E-mail address: `kojman@math.bgu.ac.il`

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, BEN GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV
E-mail address: `omri@cs.bgu.ac.il`